DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 944 95 RC 010 448

AUTHOR Ligon, Glynn; And Others
TITLE Preview: Evaluation of the 1973-1974 Bilingual/Bicultural Project. Formative Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 74
NOTE 48p.; Page 34 may not reproduce well due to small print size of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Classroom Observation Techniques; Curriculum Development; *Data Collection; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Expenditures; *Formative Evaluation; Inservice Teacher Education; Interviews; Mexican Americans; Parent Participation; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Program Planning; School Visitation; Spanish
IDENTIFIERS Austin Independent School District TX; Bicultural Education

ABSTRACT

The formative report provided the Austin Independent School District personnel with information useful for planning the remaining activities for the 1973-74 Bilingual/Bicultural Project and the activities for the 1974-75 Project. Emphasis was on what had been done to evaluate the 1973-74 Project, the data which was or would be available for the Project, the status of various programmatic activities, and available data in the special concern areas, i.e., material acquisition, inservice workshops, staff in-school visitations, and teacher/principal/parent input into planning. No data was obtained for the formal testing conducted since the pre- and post-testing had not been completed. Findings included that: the profitability of student interviews in evaluating a bilingual project was being investigated; all teachers in Project elementary and junior high schools had been administered a questionnaire in October 1973 and again in March 1974; although the 1973-74 Project used the Prueba de Lectura as the major test instrument to evaluate student progress in Spanish communication skills, steps were initiated to locate an acceptable substitute for 1974-75; there were formative evaluation reports for all completed inservice workshops; records of all monies encumbered and paid out were on file; four curriculum writers had been hired to develop units to meet the instructional needs of individual classrooms. (NQ)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

rec 19-04-78

# Research
# Development
# Evaluation

ED154944

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Freda M. Halley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DEPARTMENT
OF
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

RC010448

austin independent school district

1973 2

**Board Of Trustees**

Will D. Davis, President

M. K. Hage Jr., Vice President

Mrs. E. A. Delco Jr., Secretary

Dr. Pat A. Cato

Gustavo L. Garcia

J. Don Smith

Mrs. Barr McClellan

**Superintendent of Schools**

Dr. Jack L. Davidson

**Assistant Superintendent, Division of Instruction and Development**

Dr. Vance C. Littleton

Marshel Ashley

Director, Department of Educational Development

Dr. Freda M. Holley

Coordinator, Office of Evaluation

FORMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT

Preview: Evaluation of the 1973-1974
Bilingual/Bicultural Project


Glynn Ligon
Project Developer/Evaluator

Tom Brooks, Ph. D.
Product Evaluator

Audrey Janda
Data Specialist

Gloria Horner
Classroom Observer


Freda M Holley

Approved: Freda M. Holley, Ph.D
Coordinator of Instructional Evaluation

Approved: Marshel Ashley
Director, Department of Educational Development

April 23, 1974


Department of Educational Development
Office of Evaluation
6100 N. Guadalupe
Austin, Texas 78752
Phone: 451 6481

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT..... 2

TEACHER INTERVIEWS..... 5

STUDENT INTERVIEWS..... 6

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE..... 7

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS..... 8

SPANISH CRITERION REFERENCED TEST..... 9

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT..... 10

INSERVICE WORKSHOPS..... 12

MATERIAL ACQUISITION..... 19

SCHOOL VISITATIONS..... 25

TEACHER/PRINCIPAL/PARENT INPUT..... 29

PRODUCT EVALUATION..... 34

ADDENDUM: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT..... 35

## INTRODUCTION

This formative report was prepared to provide the personnel in the Austin Independent School District with information which might be useful for planning the remaining activities for the 1973-74 Bilingual/Bicultural Project and for planning the activities for the 1974-75 Project. Many questions have been raised concerning the Project and its evaluation which seem to require a response at this time rather than waiting for the final evaluation report in July, 1974.

No data is reported for the formal testing conducted since no comparison data is available for the pre-testing and post-testing has not yet been completed. Emphasis has been placed upon answering the following questions:

1. What is being done to evaluate the 1973-74 Bilingual/Bicultural Project?
2. What data is available or will be available for the Project?
3. What is the status of various programmatic activities?
4. What data is available in areas of special concern such as material acquisition, staff in-school visitations, and teacher/principal/parent input into planning?

The format of this report may seem a bit fragmented since each area addressed was treated in isolation and no attempt was made at this time to give an overall assessment of the Project.

## OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

The Bilingual/Bicultural Project, funded by a grant from H.E.W. under the Emergency School Aid Act, is designed to reduce the isolation of minority group students by providing not only instruction in their dominant language, if other than English (in Austin Independent School District that is Spanish), but also instructional emphasis upon the culture of the minority groups represented (Mexican American and Black). Needs addressed by Austin Independent School District's project and evaluation strategies are as outlined below.

Need: Increase communication skills in both Spanish and English for MG (minority group) students in grades K-12.

Project activity: Materials, inservice training, and teacher aides are provided bilingual classroom teachers who are teaching the communication skills in their classrooms.

Evaluation: Classrooms in project schools will be observed by project's two classroom observers three times during the year. The evaluation staff has developed and revised three observation guides for elementary classrooms, secondary classrooms, and teacher aides. The factors on each guide are rated from one (no evidence) to five (much evidence) to determine the degree of implementation of project activities. The overall objective is for each bilingual classroom to receive a rating of three or higher on at least 75% of all factors. Testing is scheduled on a pre (October, 1973) and post (April and May, 1974) basis for elementary classrooms using the McGraw-Hill Prescriptive Reading Inventory in English and the Inter-American Prueba de Lectura in Spanish. At least 50% of the students initially not meeting identified objectives on the P.R.I. will be expected to be meeting those objectives by the end of the project year. Students will also be expected to demonstrate a significant gain on the Prueba de Lectura. In the secondary schools the Prueba de Lectura is also being used; however, instead of the P.R.I., the California Achievement Test (reading sub-test) will be used to compare scores from January, 1973 to January, 1974 for project students.

Need: Develop a teaching staff trained in the special instructional skills required for successfully teaching MG students.

Project activity: Preservice and inservice workshops are planned and conducted to provide teachers with exposure to the culture and community of MG students as well as instructional strategies appropriate for bilingual education.

Evaluation: Each preservice and inservice workshop is assessed by questionnaires eliciting participants' opinions of consultants and their presentations. In addition, criterion referenced pre and post instruments measure increases in participants' skills and knowledge whenever appropiate. The degree of implementation of inservice ideas into the classrooms is recorded by the classroom observers.

Need: Increase the home support by parents of MG students' learning goals.

Project activity: The project's Parent Coordinator and eight Community Representatives work to interest, inform, and involve parents in the schools' activities.

Evaluation: During March and April the community representatives will interview a 10% random sample of parents of students in project schools to determine parental awareness of and attitudes toward the project in particular and the schools in general. In addition, all home visits and other parent contacts will be documented to indicate the scope of the community representatives' influence.

Need: Increase the experience background and self-concept of MG students.

Project activity: Field trips as well as classroom activities will be planned to broaden the range of experiences of project students. Emphasis on MG students' culture and community in instructional activities, as encouraged during teacher inservice training, is another aim of the project.

Evaluation: Experience background is reflected in a student's range of vocabulary; therefore, pre and post vocabulary tests are used to determine broadening of project students' experience backgrounds. In the junior and senior high schools a specially designed vocabulary test, developed by the Southwest Educational Development Lab, will be administered to a 15% sample of project students. The Piers-Harris Self-Concept Test (grades 3-6) and the Primary Self-Concept Scale for Children (grades K-2) are administered pre and post to students in bilingual classrooms to assess changes in self concept during the project year.

The evaluation staff of the Bilingual/Bicultural Project is currently initiating activities which will result in the development of a criterion referenced test to replace the Pruebas de Lectura in the 1974 - 1975 school year. Other instruments developed specifically for the project include the Elementary Classroom Observation Guide, the Secondary Classroom Observation Guide, a teacher interview form, a parent questionnaire, and various individual inservice workshop evaluation instruments.

The evaluation design is intended to assess both the degree of implementation of the project's proposed activities as well as their effects upon student behavioral outcomes.

## TEACHER INTERVIEWS

During the months of February and March, 1974, each classroom teacher in the project elementary schools and three of the four secondary bilingual teachers were interviewed by a person from the Office of Evaluation. A formative report concerning the data collected through these interviews will be written at a later date.

Although some interviews were conducted by the project's evaluators, the majority were conducted by the classroom observers with help from the data specialist. The interviews at Palm and Metz were conducted in cooperation with teacher interviews by the Project Assist observers.

The interviews lasted about ten to twenty minutes each. There were two major emphases:

1. Collecting data about classroom activities not readily available through classroom observations.
2. Eliciting teacher opinions about the project.

Preliminary analysis of the teachers' responses reveals the following findings:

1. The most beneficial aspect of the Bilingual/ Bicultural Project has been the emphasis placed upon pride in minority group cultures and the acceptance of Spanish as an instructional language.
2. The most disappointing aspect of the Project has been the lack of materials and the long waits for materials needed to implement the project.

At the first school interviewed, Allison, teachers were asked whether they preferred being interviewed to answering a questionnaire. Eighty per cent preferred the interview as a means of expressing their ideas and opinions.

## STUDENT INTERVIEWS

The profitability of student interviews in evaluating a bilingual project is being investigated. Palm Elementary has been selected for this pilot student interview project. Fifth graders who have been in bilingual classrooms for only one year and third graders who have been in bilingual classrooms since kindergarten will be interviewed to discover the effect of bilingual education in the affective domain.

To test the effects of interviewer characteristics upon the openness of students' responses, both adults and fifth grade students will be used as interviewers. Depending upon the results of these interviews, a decision will be made as to the desirability of interviewing students in other schools and the desirability of using adult and/or peer interviewers.

The program questions to be answered by these student interviews are:

1. How do students in the third and fifth grade bilingual classrooms at Palm Elementary feel about learning Spanish in school?
2. How do these students feel about the activities funded by the ESAA Bilingual/Bicultural Project?

The evaluation and research questions to be answered by these student interviews are:

1. Are student interviews a valid and reliable evaluation alternative?
2. Do students respond differentially to adult and peer interviewers?

## TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

All teachers in Project elementary and junior high schools were administered a questionnaire in October, 1973 and again in March, 1974. The questionnaire addressed itself to several areas, one of which was the Bilingual/Bicultural Project. These questions were of two types - general questions about the Project and general questions about bilingual education.

The questionnaires have not been analyzed as of this writing; however, the results are expected to help answer two basic questions:

1. Did the opinions held by teachers in Project schools about the Bilingual/Bicultural Project change from October to March? If so, was this change positive or negative.

2. Did the opinions held by teachers in Project schools about bilingual education change from October to March? If so, was this change positive or negative?

## CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Two Classroom Observers were hired to collect within classrooms in project schools information which will assist (along with interview data, questionnaire data, and material availability data) in answering the following program questions.

1. What is the degree of implementation of the Bilingual/Bicultural's proposed program within project classrooms?
2. To what extent are the ideas and skills emphasized in inservice workshops being demonstrated in the classroom?

Each classroom in the project elementary schools and each classroom served by the project's secondary bilingual teachers will be observed three times during the 1973-74 school year. During each observation, the observer will complete the appropriate classroom observation guide developed by the evaluation staff.

At the completion of each round of observations at an elementary school, the principal is provided a summary for his school. In most cases a faculty meeting has been scheduled to discuss the school summary.

Two rounds of observation are complete for each project school. The general trends reported may be summarized as follows:

1. Elementary classrooms generally exhibit a high level of teacher preparedness, an atmosphere conducive toward learning, and plentiful and colorful displays.
2. Elementary classrooms generally exhibit a low level of first hand activities and a low frequency of activities and displays reflecting the backgrounds and cultures of the students.
3. Secondary bilingual teachers' activities and classroom responsibilities vary widely from school to school and from classroom to classroom.

All completed classroom observation forms and school summaries are on file in the Office of Evaluation. Upon completion of the final observations, analysis of the data will show what percentage of the classrooms in the project schools were meeting the criteria established for acceptable program implementation.

TEST DEVELOPMENT: SPANISH
CRITERION REFERENCED TEST

The 1973-74 Bilingual/Bicultural Project used the Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura, as the major test instrument in evaluating student progress in Spanish communication skills. Although this series is probably the most widely used Spanish test by bilingual programs in the Southwest, there are several critical limitations inherent in its use as an evaluation instrument. These limitations were encountered by teachers and students in the Austin Independent School District during October's pretesting schedule.

The dissatisfactions with these tests were communicated to the project's evaluation staff through faculty meetings, principal conferences, and counselor conferences. As a result, in November, steps were initiated to locate an acceptable substitute for 1974-75. Inherent in the final decision was the desire to attend to the specific criteria required by both the teachers and the project's evaluation. Therefore, the test must:

1. diagnose reading levels
2. identify specific areas of need
3. identify appropriate instructional objectives
4. prescribe required instructional activities
5. be amenable to administration on each student's level
6. contain vernacular and vocabulary which is locally acceptable
7. be referenced to materials and activities actually being used
8. be referenced to stated objectives at each grade level
9. be scorable in a manner which allows comparison of measured pretest skills with post-test skills

The only alternative entertained which met all of these criteria was to develop a project criterion referenced test. Therefore, the logistics of developing such a test were assessed and a general plan devised for preparing an instrument to be ready for use in September, 1974.

The human resources required were drawn from project staff, bilingual teachers, curriculum writers, consultants from other bilingual projects, and the staff from the Austin Independent School District Office of Evaluation. Program objectives for Spanish instruction in each grade K-5 were formalized by bilingual teachers and then translated into test items.

Test forms for grades K-5 will be pilot tested with project students in May, 1974. Final tests will be printed during the summer, and instruction booklets, test booklets, and answer sheets will be available by September, 1974.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

The evaluation of parental involvement activities consists of two parts - documentation of parent participation in school activities and interviewing of parents to assess their attitude toward and knowledge of school activities. To conduct the proposed activities, a Parent Coordinator was hired to direct the activities of the two Bilingual/Bicultural Community Representatives at each elementary campus. These Community Representatives visit homes, refer parents to appropriate agencies, and conduct community meetings in homes.

The Parent Coordinator has kept a daily log of her activities, including all meetings with the Community Representatives and parents. In December, 1973, two parents from each elementary and secondary project school were trained as "parent leaders." These parents then guided a series of ten night sessions with about 75 parents from the project schools during the months of February, March, and April, 1974. These sessions were planned to provide parents an opportunity to meet together and to discuss topics of interest. Topics addressed during these sessions, speakers invited, and other activities conducted are being recorded along with the names and schools of participants.

Community Representatives at each elementary school have recorded visits by parents. At the secondary schools, these records are kept in the office. Participation this year will be compared with available data from last year to determine any changes in the level of parent interest in school activities.

To assess the parents' awareness of their children's learning goals and school activities, a questionnaire has been developed and will be administered to a

random sample of parents from each project school during the month of May. The Community Representatives will administer these questionnaires in interview form within the homes. As a comparison group, all participants in the parent training sessions will be questioned also. The information collected will be used as base line data for the Bilingual/Bicultural Project and as a basis for planning parental involvement activities for 1974-75.

## INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

Each inservice workshop conducted by the Bilingual/ Bicultural Project has been accompanied by some form of evaluation to assess its effectiveness in meeting stated objectives, to measure participants' reactions to the activities, and to elicit participants' comments and recommendations. Formative evaluation reports for all completed inservice workshops are on file in the Office of Evaluation.

From these evaluations, several general problem areas and recommendations for improvement have been identified. The following page is a summary of these problems and the solutions pursued or being planned.

Following this summary is a table listing the workshops which have been sponsored by the Bilingual/Bicultural Project, participants, dates, duration, and a summary evaluation statement for each.

In general, teachers have expressed the feeling that attending workshops concerning topics about which they are already well informed or for which they have no practical use are a waste of their time. This has been a consideration in the planning of all workshops since November, 1973.

During the first workshop in August, 1973, teachers indicated that the need for more information about the Project, in general, was of low priority. However, after a month of working with implementing the Project, they expressed a widespread and pressing need for clarification of programatic goals and objectives (as evidenced by comments from the November 6, 1973 inservice day). To date no specific workshop has been conducted to answer this need. However, some information has been disseminated by the Project staff in faculty meetings and school visitations. This remains a major concern of Bilingual teachers.

As a by product of the development of a Spanish criterion referenced test for the 1974-75 project year, specific behavioral instructional objectives have now been formalized for grades K-5. As of March, 1974, these objectives have been distributed to only those teachers involved in the test development.

All other problem areas, as outlined in the summary that follows, have been or are being resolved by the project staff. Overall the inservice training provided by the Project seems to have been beneficial for the majority of teachers participating.

One week of inservice training was provided prior to the beginning of classes. All teachers in Project schools were encouraged to attend. This has been the only training provided to Monolingual teachers of Bicultural classrooms unless they chose to attend one of the bilingually and/or biculturally related workshops offered as part of the district's two spring teacher workdays. Bilingual teachers and Monolingual team teachers of Bilingual/Bicultural classrooms have attended an additional three and one-half days of training. Bilingual teacher aides have received an additional two and one-half days of training. Because of the contrasts between the expectations of the Bilingual/Bicultural Project for its personnel and tne expectations for other schools' personnel, a great amount of training is necessary for the objectives of the project to be met within each classroom. Therefore, if there is one overriding shortcoming of the Bilingual staff development program, it is the limited amount of training teachers, especially Bicultural teachers, and teacher aides have received.

## INSERVICE WORKSHOP PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

| Frequently Encountered Problems | Solution |
|---|---|
| 1. Personnel Office is unable to supply bilingual substitutes for bilingual classes. | 1. Bilingual teachers and substitutes are being recruited for 1974-75. |
| 2. Personnel Office is unable to supply enough substitutes when the number of teachers attending a workshop is too large. Principals are given responsibility of managing a school with most of regular staff absent. | 2. Workshops since January, 1974 have been scheduled for smaller groups each day and repeated so all teachers could attend. Demand for substitutes at one time has been reduced. Workshops have been planned so that only a few teachers from each school are attending at one time. |
| 3. Communication of workshop dates, times, locations, and participants is inadequate, especially regarding last minute changes. | 3. Since November, 1973 all notices of inservice workshops have been specific as to who is to attend. Since February, 1974 both principals and teachers have been provided written notification of workshops.* The responsibility for notifying teachers has not been the schools'. No definite procedures have been established regarding last minute changes except to have everyone aware of the difficulty of notifying everyone concerned. |

* Copies of all notifications were to have been sent for each teacher affected; however, this procedure has not been followed consistently.

INSERVICE WORKSHOP PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS (Continued)

| Frequently Encountered Problems | Solution |
| --- | --- |
| 4. Workshops, have not taken into account differences in teachers' previous experience and training nor differences in the appropriateness of activities for various grade levels. | 4. For the December 13, 1973 inservice workshop, participants were given a pretest to measure their current knowledge and experience with the activities. For the workshops planned since January, 1974, participants have been grouped by grade level to ensure appropriateness of activities. Plans for future inservice workshops will be made with individual teacher differences in mind. |
| 5. Too much theory and lecturing are emphasized in workshops instead of practical activities which the teachers can implement in their classrooms. | 5. Since December, 1973, workshops have emphasized this practical aspect of activities. For example, workshops have been conducted on the uses of the Language Master, classroom management and the effective cooperation of teachers and aides, and making materials and games appropriate for classroom use. |

15

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
1973 - 1974

| | |
|---|---|
| Topic: | Summer Workshop - program description, bilingual methods and materials, cultural awareness. |
| Date: | August 13 - 17, 1973 (5 days) |
| Participants: | Teachers from all Project elementary and secondary schools (250) |
| Evaluation: | Participants were administered a workshop assessment instrument developed by S.E.D.L. This was a criterion type test designed to measure teachers' knowledge of methods in teaching minority group students, culture of minority groups, and basic information about the Bilingual/Bicultural Project.*<br><br>In addition, each participant completed a questionnaire about the workship's value to them and in which areas they would like to receive more training.* |
| Topic: | Bilingual Education - ideas and methods |
| Date: | November 6, 1973 (1 day) |
| Participants: | Bilingual teachers and monolingual team teachers in project elementary schools (50). |
| Evaluation: | Participants completed an inservice evaluation instrument indicating their opinions of the consultants and topics they encountered. Comments about this workshop and suggestions for future workshops were made.* |
| Topic: | Language Master - use and adaptation of Language Masters in a bilingual classroom. |
| Date: | December 6, 1973 (½ day per participant)<br>December 13, 1973 |
| Participants: | Elementary teacher aides (30) and bilingual teacher teams (50) |
| Evaluation: | A pre and post criterion referenced instrument designed to measure knowledge of the uses of the Language Master in general and in a bilingual program was administered. In addition a questionnaire was completed by participants expressing their assessment of the activities.* |

Topic: Training of Parent Leaders - planning of parent training sessions

Date: December 13 - 14, 1973 (2days)

Participants: Two parents from each project elementary and secondary school (16).

Evaluation: Participants made written comments about the training sessions.*

Topic: Parental Involvement Training - becoming informed about school activities and how to effectively encourage children to achieve in school.

Date: From February 13, 1974 to April 17, 1974
(10 two-hour sessions per participant)

Participants: Parents from all project schools (70).

Evaluation: Documentation is being made of all sessions and those parents attending. A parent questionnaire will be administered to all participants measuring their knowledge of and support of their children's learning goals and school activities.**

Topic: Make It Yourself Workshop - idea sharing and making of games and other materials for classroom use.

Date: February 7, 1974 (4th and 5th grades)
March 11, 1974 (3rd grade)
March 20, 1974 (1st grade)
March 22, 1974 (2nd grade)
March 25, 1974 (Kindergarten)
(1 day)

Participants: All elementary bilingual and monolingual team teachers (50).

Evaluation: Each participant was provided a worksheet on which to record all materials for activities made during the day. Activities were rated for their novelty as well as their utility. General workshop impressions were also given and comments made.*

Topic: Teacher - Aide Workshop - cooperation between teachers and aides was discussed and teaching techniques explored.

Date: March 19, 1974 (2nd and 3rd grades)
March 29, 1974 (Kand 1st grades)
April 29, 1974 (4th and 5th grades)
(1 day)

Participants: All elementary bilingual aides (30) and the teachers they work with (50).

Evaluation: Each participant was administered an evaluation instrument on which to indicate reactions to the workshop activities and to write additional comments.*

* Report on file in Office of Evaluation
** Report to be prepared

## Materials Acquisition

The Bilingual/Bicultural Project has hired one Materials Specialist and one clerk-typist to administer the selection, evaluation, ordering, cataloguing, and dissemination of all equipment, materials, and supplies, categorical and discretionary, specified and unspecified, in the proposal. The Materials Specialist met with the faculties of each project school several times during the months of September and October to explain the materials requisition process and to note teacher suggestions of materials beneficial to their schools.

After all designated items had been ordered and monies encumbered, the elementary schools were notified in January, 1974 of the specific amount remaining available to them for consumable supplies. The distribution of this available sum within each school was left to the discretion of each faculty. Prior to January, teachers had been informed of and were following the procedure of sending the Materials Specialist a written request for materials and supplies desired. These requests are on file in the Bilingual Bicultural Project Office along with copies of the orders made from them. Requests for materials and supplies available through local school funds were returned to the schools.

Records of all monies encumbered and paid out are on file. These records include all materials and supplies received and the school to which they were distributed.

Many and frequent delays have been encountered in the ordering of and the receipt of materials, supplies, and equipment. Attached are tables identifying major purchases with their dates of order and receipt.

The major reasons for delays in ordering items have been:

1. The requirement of solicitation of bids for equipment
2. The identification and evaluation process for selecting items appropriate for the project
3. The placing of priorities for the time of the Materials Specialist upon
   a. ordering more important items first
   b. distribution of items received (including delivery to schools)
   c. school visitations
   d. preparing 1974-75 proposal
4. The necessity of submitting budget amendments to allow ordering necessary programs and supplementary supplies required by equipment specified in the proposal.

The major reasons for delays in receiving items have been:

1. Quantities ordered exhaust distributor's supplies
2. Many Spanish materials come from outside the United States
3. Austin Independent School District's purchase requisition procedures which require up to two weeks for proper approval
4. Absence of delivery and/or pick up capabilities between the schools and the Bilingual/Bicultural Project Office.

At the end of the school year, materials and supplies received and used in the project schools will be evaluated by the teachers. Their recommendations concerning these items and items they would like to have next year will be solicited.

MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES ORDERED

| Materials Specified in Proposal | Date Ordered | If Ordering Delayed, Why? | Date Received | If Receipt Delayed, Why? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| E.S.C. Region XIII Cultural Guide | Aug., 73 | -- | Jan., 74 | Quantity ordered |
| SEDL Social Education Materials | Feb., 74 | ** | -- | -- |
| HDP Program | March, 74 | Inservice training required; reconsidered appropriateness of H.D.P. | -- | -- |
| Dev. Understanding of Self and Others | March, 74 | Publisher, Levels, etc. unknown | -- | -- |
| Display Pictures | Feb., 74 | Comparing pictures for most appropriate; books - given priority over displays. | | -- |
| Laidlaw Readers | Sept., 73 | -- | Oct., 73 | -- |
| Addison-Wesley Math Series | Sept., 73 | -- | Oct., 73 | -- |
| S.C.D.C. Kits | Sept., 73 | -- | Nov., 73 | -- |
| Eng. Around the World | Oct., 73 | -- | Nov., 73 | -- |
| Preparándose Para Leer | Oct., 73 | -- | Nov., 73 | -- |
| El Nuevo Sembrador | Nov., 73 | Comparing other supplementary readers | Dec., 73 | -- |
| A.I.S.D. Oral Lang. Guides | Sept., 73 | -- | Sept., 73 | -- |
| Let's Speak Spanish | Nov., 73 | ** | Jan., 74 | T.E.A. approval |
| Rock and Roll | Dec., 73 | ** | Jan., 74 | ** |

**The ordering of these items was delayed in deference to the ordering of some items at each grade level so no classroom would be totally without materials.

UNIT COST AND TOTALS FOR
MAJOR MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES
PURCHASED BEFORE APRIL 1, 1974

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Region XIII Culture Guide | 301 @ $ 5.00 | $ 1,505.00 |
| 2. | SEDL Social Education | for 1st gr. 19 @ 111.00 | 2,109.00 |
| | | 2nd gr. 21 @ 189.00 | 3,969.00 |
| | | 3rd gr. 4 @ 237.00 | 948.00 |
| | | 3rd gr. 4 @ 129.00 | 2,580.00 |
| | | | $ 9,606.00 |
| 3. | HDP Program | 18 for K @ $ 8.95 | $ 161.10 |
| | | 43 Level 1 @ 8.95 | 384.85 |
| | | 41 Level 2 @ 8.95 | 366.95 |
| | | 43 Level 3 @ 8.95 | 384.85 |
| | | 20 Level 4 @ 8.95 | 179.00 |
| | | 125 Manuals @ 6.95 | 868.75 |
| | | 300 High Sch. @ 5.95 | 1,785.00 |
| | | | $ 4,130.50 |
| 4. | Developing Understanding of Self & Others | 18 for K @ $ 95.00 | $ 1,710.00 |
| 5. | Display Pictures | 2 sets per elementary schools<br>4 schools x 2 sets = 8 x 378 | $ 3,024.00 |
| 6. | Laidlaw Readers and Workbooks | | $ 4,378.80 |
| 7. | Addison Wesley Math | K 120 books @ $ 1.50 | $ 180.00 |
| | | 1 120 books @ 2.50 | 300.00 |
| | | 2 120 books @ 2.50 | 300.00 |
| | | 3 120 books @ 3.00 | 360.00 |
| | | 20 Guides @ 5.95 | 119.00 |
| | | | $ 1,259.00 |
| 8. | SCDC | Kits 1 and 2 | $ 2,732.60 |
| 9. | English Around the World | Level 1 | $ 789.39 |
| | | Level 2 | 421.74 |
| | | | $ 1,212.13 |
| 10. | Preparandose Para Leer | | $ 467.64 |
| 11. | El Nuevo Sembrador | Books 1-4 | $ 761.00 |
| 12. | AISD Oral Language Guides | .01¢ per page | |
| 13. | Let's Speak Spanish Books - State Adopted tapes | | $ 632.40 |
| 14. | Rock and Roll | | $ 280.00 |
| | | Total this page | $31,699.07 |

EQUIPMENT ORDERED

| Equipment | Special Approval Required | Date Approval Received | Date Ordered | Date Received |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Filmstrip Projectors | A. I. S. D. Bids | Jan., 74 | Jan., 74 | |
| Cassette Records | A. I. S. D. Bids | Jan., 74 | Jan., 74 | |
| Record Players | A. I. S. D. Bids | Jan., 74 | Jan., 74 | March, 74 |
| Listening Stations | A. I. S. D. Bids | Jan., 74 | Jan., 74 | Feb., 74 |
| Language Masters | Bid Exemption | Nov., 73 | Nov., 73 | Dec., 73 |
| Cameras | Price Comparisons | Oct., 73 | Oct., 73 | Oct., 73 |
| Video Tape Recorder | None | | Sept., 73 | Dec., 73 |
| Hoffman Viewer | Budget Revision | Feb., 74 | Feb., 74 | |

UNIT COST AND TOTALS FOR
EQUIPMENT PURCHASED
BEFORE APRIL 1, 1974

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Filmstrip Projectors | 63 @ $ 69.00 | $ 4,347.00 |
| Cassette Recorders | 67 x 44.74 | $ 2,997.58 |
| Record Players | 93 @ 51.49 | $ 4,788.57 |
| Listening Stations | 55 @ 53.34 | $ 2,933.70 |
| Language Masters | 40 @ 250.00 | $10,000.00 |
| Cameras | 14 @ 34.88 | $ 488.32 |
| Video Tape Recorder | Recorder 660.00<br>Cameras 705.00<br>Recervier 227.00 | $ 1,592.00 |
| Hoffman Viewer and Programs | | $ 1,064.00 |
| Cassettee Players | 107 @ 24.25 | $ 2,594.75 |
| | Total this page | $30,805.92 |

## PROJECT SCHOOLS VISITATION

The evaluation staff has received comments from teachers and principals in project schools since the beginning of the classroom observation process that one of the most pressing needs was to have someone from the project staff available to help them organize their schedules, plan their curricula, and clarify the objectives of the project. This need has been expressed repeatedly in several forms:

1. Written comments from the November 6, 1973 inservice workshop
2. Verbal comments by teachers to the classroom observers
3. Verbal comments by teachers to the evaluator during faculty meetings
4. Verbal comments by principals during conferences with the evaluator
5. Verbal comments expressed to and relayed by the Assistant Superintendent directing ESAA projects
6. Comments recorded during interviews of all project elementary teachers during February and March
7. Written and verbal comments from teachers directed to the ESAA Advisory Committee

During the month of December, the project staff was directed by the Assistant Superintendent to be in the schools as much as possible and to make a monthly schedule of each school to be visited and when. These schedules were compiled, printed and distributed during January, February, and March, 1974. These schedules do not acurrately reflect the actual visits by staff members since a large proportion of scheduled visits were not actually made.

Attached is a summary of the number of times each staff member has been to each of the project schools. The figures are for September 4, 1973 to March 15, 1974. This period includes 125 days of classes. There are no available data from comparable projects with which to compare the frequency of visitation. However, if conferences with principals, counselors, community representatives, and other non-instructional personnel are dropped from the chart, visitations by the evaluation staff are excluded, and visits for delivery of materials are not counted, then the number of times schools were visited to aid teachers or just visit teachers in their classrooms becomes approximately 5% of the total school visits (or about 20). These in-class visits were multiple, so the best estimate possible of the actual number of times classrooms were visited is between 80 and 100. Since some of these classroom visits have been to the same classrooms, the actual number of different classrooms visited must be considerably fewer than the total of 112 elementary bilingual and bicultural classrooms and 10 secondary bilingual classrooms.

There have been several major reasons expressed for the infrequency of these in-school visits.

1. The project for 1973-74 is understaffed in positions which provide direct teacher contact (e.g. instructional coordinators).
2. The administrative requirements placed upon the present staff prevent being in the schools.
3. Submission of the 1974-75 proposal demanded much staff time.
4. The Project Coordinator was ill often over a period of about a month.
5. Administrative duties were assigned a higher priority than in-school visits.

From this evaluation, several needs seem to require attention.

1. Project teachers need supervision and guidance in their classrooms in defining and implementing project activities.
2. Priorites need to be reconsidered, especially in regards to staff activities during school time so that more importance is placed upon in-school visitation than in-office administration.
3. Future programs need to provide adequate staff for supervising teachers in the project schools.

## SCHOOL VISITATIONS BY BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL PROJECT STAFF

| WEEK | | Govalle | | | Allison | | | Metz | | | Palm | | | Total | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. |
| Sept. | 4 - 7 | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | 10 - 14 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17 - 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | 24 - 28 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Oct. | 1 - 5 | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| | 8 - 12 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| | 15 - 19 | | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | 22 - 26 | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| | 29 -Nov.2 | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Nov. | 5 - 9 | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | 12 - 16 | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 19 - 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 26 - 30 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Dec. | 3 - 7 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 10 - 14 | | 4 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 3 |
| | 17 - 21 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| Jan. | 2 - 4 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | 7 - 11 | | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| | 14 - 18 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| | 21 - 25 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| | 28 -Feb.1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 11 |
| Feb. | 4 - 8 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | 11 - 15 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| | 18 - 22 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| | 25 -Mar.1 | | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 |
| Mar. | 4 - 8 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| | 11 - 15 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | 4 | 0 | 1 |

| | Govalle | | | Allison | | | Metz | | | Palm | | | Total | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. | Coor | M.S. | P.C. |
| TOTAL TO DATE | 8 | 27 | 31 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 10 | 12 | 23 | 32 | 63 | 91 |

Coor = Project Coordinator  M.S. = Materials Specialist  P.C. = Parent Coordinator

TOTAL SCHOOL VISITS - SEPTEMBER 4, 1973 TO MARCH 15, 1974

| Programatic Staff | Govalle | Allison | Metz | Palm | Allan | Martin | Johnston | Austin | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project Coordinator | 8 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 43 |
| Materials Specialist | 27 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 81 |
| Parent Coordinator | 31 | 14 | 23 | 23 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 95 |
| (TOTAL) | (66) | (29) | (46) | (45) | (11) | (10) | (3) | (9) | (219) |
| Evaluation Staff | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluator I (since 10-11-73) | 10 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 51 |
| Evaluator II (since 11-26-73) | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| Classroom Observers | 52 | 58 | 55 | 49 | 14 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 134 |
| (TOTAL) | (64) | (74) | (67) | (59) | (20) | (16) | (16) | (19) | (335) |
| TOTAL | 130 | 103 | 113 | 104 | 31 | 26 | 19 | 28 | 554 |

From September 4, 1973 to March 15, 1974 there were 125 school days (not including staff development and teacher workdays).

Staff Members - School Visitations Include (in order of frequency):

Project Coordinator - principal and/or teacher conference, classroom visitations, faculty meetings

Materials Specialist - delivery of materials, teacher conferences, classroom visitations, faculty meetings

Parent Coordinator - conferences with community representatives, classroom visitations

Evaluators - principal conferences, faculty meetings, teacher interviews, classroom observations

Classroom Observers - classroom observations, teacher interviews, faculty meetings

## TEACHER / PRINCIPAL / PARENT INPUT IN PROGRAMATIC PLANNING

A major question that has been raised repeatedly during the first year of the ESAA Bilingual/Bicultural Project has been whether the teachers, principals, and parents have been given sufficient opportunity to have input about their suggestions for programatic activities. In writing this report concerning the actual amount of input from teachers, principals, and parents three questions were addressed.

1. How much opportunity for input have project teachers, principals, and parents had in the planning of programatic activities?
2. Has there been sufficient, insufficient, or more than sufficient opportunity for input?
3. How should teachers', principals', and parents' input be organized for the 74-75 program?

The following summary is in response to question one.

### ESAA Advisory Committee

No teacher from a Bilingual/Bicultural Project school was active as a member of this committee before February, 1974 No principal from a project school is a member. A total of five parents from project schools are members.

### Proposal Writing

The 73-74 ESAA Bilingual/Bicultural Project's proposal was designed and written by a committee of teachers, principals, administrators who had some relationship with the local bilingual project or some other special qualification. Eight teachers from project schools were included. Five principals from project schools were included. The proposal was presented to and reviewed by the ESAA Advisory Committee as well as being discussed in a public hearing.

The 74-75 ESAA Bilingual/Bicultural Project's proposal was written when the initial project year was three months old; therefore, the administration and project staff did not formally elicit input from any group, but reproduced the 73-74 proposal with minor changes. Informal comments made by principals and teachers were considered in making the minor changes. The proposal was presented to and reviewed by the ESAA Advisory Committee and a public hearing held as was done in for previous year. Upon notification of changes and funding level recommended by the Office of Education's

reviewing committee, copies of the 74-75 program narrative were sent to each elementary school and suggestions were elicited. Two schools responded and two did not. At one of these schools the suggestions were from both the principal and teachers; at the other, just the teachers submitted suggestions. Another public hearing was held with individual notices being sent to all bilingual teachers and principals.

Ordering of Materials

The 73-74 proposal specifically identified all of the equipment and most of the instructional materials to be purchased. The decision of how to spend discretionary money was partly reserved by the Materials Specialist and partly opened to the teachers. At the beginning of the year, teachers were informed of the types of materials which they could personally request for their classrooms and the requisition procedure. In addition, in January each elementary school was given $350 to spend as they wished within program guidelines.

Teachers expressed confusion about what to order. Some requested that the project pay travel expenses for them to visit a teacher supply company in San Antonio. No travel monies were available so this was not done.

At the end of May, teachers will be asked to evaluate the materials they received this year and to suggest materials to be ordered in the summer for the fall.

Inservice Training

The initial workshop week prior to the beginning of classes was followed by an evaluation process which elicited teachers' reactions to each workshop segment and their own opinions of their need for further training in each area. Each inservice workshop conducted during the school year has been followed by a similar evaluation and comments have been considered by the project staff in planning subsequent workshops.

During the spring teacher interviews, each teacher was asked in which areas he/she would like to receive training.

Regarding release time for inservice workshops, principals, project staff, and district administrators held a special conference to clarify procedures in November.

Field Trips

Choices of and planning of local field trips have been left completely up to the teachers and principals.

The field trip to San Antonio was specifically described in the proposal as a secondary school activity. The Project Coordinator requested permission to spend available money to take all elementary bilingual classrooms. Permission was granted for grades 2 - 5 only. Teachers were sent a brief questionnaire on which to indicate their preferences of places to visit in San Antonio. These preferences were used in planning each grade level's trip.

Instructional Objectives, 74-75

As a preliminary to the development of a Spanish criterion referenced test, instructional objectives for each grade level were formalized. All project bilingual teachers were invited to join in the project. Eleven worked one Saturday to decide upon appropriate objectives. With the exception of consultants' guidance these objectives are completely the product of project teachers.

Interviews and Questionnaires

In February and March, each teacher in all project schools was interviewed by a person from the Office of Evaluation. Part of the interview was devoted to eliciting comments concerning teachers' reactions to and recommendations for the Bilingual/Bicultural Project.

In October, all teachers, aides, and principals, were administered a questionnaire concerning the project and its implementation. This questionnaire was repeated in March.

In April a sample of approximately 400 parents will be interviewed by the Community Representatives.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation staff has met with each faculty concerning both the testing procedures and the classroom observation process. As a result of their comments, sampling procedures were incorporated into the 74-75 evaluation design to decrease the test load on students, and development of a Spanish criterion referenced test has begun to replace the Spanish test used in 73-74. Teachers have been the major resource in the development of this test.

After each classroom observation, teachers are given a reaction form on which to comment about the observation. The form for the final observation has been revised to elicit recommendations for improving the observation process for 74-75.

Curriculum Development

Each elementary school has been provided a Curriculum Writer. This person has been in the school everyday from September to November and two days per week since November. The Curriculum Writer has conferred with the teachers concerning materials and instructional units needed, providing the most personal contact with program staff and the most constant avenue for input into program development.

Newsletter

In March, all project personnel were asked to contribute to a newsletter as a mean of improving communications and providing teachers an opportunity to share their experiences. No teacher responded within the month following this request.

The preceding is a summary which answers question number one. Answering the second question is much more difficult. What are the criteria for sufficient input? Since these criteria will vary from level to level, from superintendent to teacher, then the only conclusion that can be made at this time is actually the first recommendation under question number three.

Recommendation #1

A delineation of the criteria for what constitutes "sufficient input" should be formalized to a reasonable extent. Of course, teachers, principals, and parents should be a part of this decision process.

Recommendation #2

The input now occurring is beneficial to the project. All input procedures currently employed should be continued.

Recommendation #3

The ESAA Advisory Committee is the main formal review body set-up for the Bilingual/Bicultural Project.

The ESAA Advisory Committee should have at least one teacher from each project school as a member. At least one principal of a project school should be a member.

Recommendation #4

There is a need for more personal contact and discussion between project staff and teachers (see discussion of in-school visitation by staff).

Project staff should meet with each school's faculty, formally or informally, on a regular basis. Curriculum Writers should remain in close contact with teachers. Supervisors are needed to function as another means of insuring that all teachers' needs and concerns are known.

Recommendation #5

There is a need for good communications with teachers, so that their input can be informed, as well as a need for a forum through which teachers' comments may be expressed. A project newsletter should be published on a regular basis to meet these needs.

Recommendation #6

The proposal for 75-76 will be a real opportunity for everyone to contribute what has been learned in the first year and one-half of the project. A committee (of reasonable size) including project teachers, principals, and parents should be formed early to write the proposal.

| Objective | | Population | Instrument | Time and Methods of Data Collection | Person Responsible For Administration | Analysis Techniques | Person Responsible Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. 1 | Significant gain in Spanish Reading Achieve. | K-6 students in Spanish reading program at Allison Govalle, Metz and Palm | Prueba de Lectura (L-2-CEs;L-2-DEs) | Pre-test October 1973, (Form C) Post-test April 1974 with paral. form (Form D) | Project Evaluator | Groups X Trials ANOVA | Project Evaluator |
| I. 2a | Significantly greater number attaining mastery on 50% of selected objectives | All 1-6 students in English Reading Program | Prescriptive Reading Inventory | Pre-test October 1973 Post-test April 1974 | Coordinator of Group Testing | Test for non-independent proportions | CTB/McGraw Hill Co |
| I. 2b | Significant gain in basic reading skills | All Kindergarten students | Boehm Test of Basic Concepts | Pre-test October 1973 Post-test January 1974 | Coordinator of Group Testing | Groups X Trials ANOVA | Project Evaluator |
| II. 1 | Significantly higher English Reading scores for Bilingual program students than for Bilingual Control students | Target and control Bilingual secondary students | California Achievement Test (Reading scales only) | One test, given April, 1974 to group of students in Bilingual program and to control group | Project Evaluator | One-tailed T-test | Project Evaluator |
| II. 2 | Significantly greater Spanish Reading Achieve. gain for Bilingual program students than for control students | a. Target and Control Bilingual junior high school students b. Target and Control Bilingual senior high school students | Prueba de Lectura (L-2-CEs;L-2-DEs) | Pre-test target and Control groups October 1973 (Form C) Post-test target and control groups April 1974 (Form D) | Project Evaluator | Two-between, one-within ANOVA | Project Evaluator |
| VI.1a, | VI2a Significant improvement of Self Concept | All K-2 students in Project Schools | Primary Self Concept Test | Pre-test November, 1973 Post-test April, 1974 | Project Evaluator | Groups X Trials ANOVA | Project Evaluator |
| VI.1b, | VI2b Significant improvement of Self Concept | All 3-6 students in Project schools | Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale | Pre-test October 1973, Post-test April, 1974 | Grades 3-4 Coordinator of Group Testing Grades 5-6 Project Evaluator | Groups X Trials ANOVA | Project Evaluator |

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Division of Instruction and Development
Department of Educational Development
Office of Evaluation

# CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
Formative Evaluation Report
February 26, 1974

Four Curriculum Writers were employed in September and assigned one to each project elementary school. Their primary identified role was developing units to meet the instructional needs of individual classrooms. However, because of the latitude allowed in defining specific activities, various non-curriculum duties were assigned to and/or assumed by the writers. As a result, in November, 1973, the writers were requested to work together at the administration building on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Mondays and Fridays were reserved for in-school activities.

Besides developing instructional units for the classroom teachers, the writers' actual school duties previous to November's reassignment were as follows.

Palm Elementary
- talk with teachers to determine needs
- observe classrooms on teacher's request
- help principal with paperwork
- man office when secretary out

Metz Elementary
- meet with teachers about
    a) materials
    b) methods
    c) scheduling
    d) classroom management
- office work such as
    a) registration
    b) inventory
    c) duplicating materials
- meet with aides concerning
    a) suggestions
    b) discipline
    c) methods
- help with dancing, music, sewing

Govalle Elementary
- help in registration
- help in cafeteria
- meet with aides for
    a) discussion of problems
    b) inservice
    c) classes at Austin Community College
- meet with teachers for
    a) scheduling
    b) materials for ESL, SSL, reading
    c) team teaching

- delivering materials
- work with librarian in ordering and evaluating Spanish materials

Allison Elementary
- survey teacher needs
- prepare lessons to complement social studies, bicultural
- write stories and poems for children in primary grades
- demonstrate dancing and singing for cultural activities
- tutor reading
- demonstrate lessons prepared by writers.
- organize suggested schedule for cultural activities
- Spanish lessons for monolingual teachers
- suggest audio - visual and bibliographic resources to library and media center.
- help in registration
- interpret for teachers and parents

Activities performed and materials prepared by the writers as a group include:

Thanksgiving Unit - prepared, taught, observed, and revised for 1974-75.

Christmas Unit - prepared, taught, observed, and revised for 1974-75

Language Master Workshop - demonstrated Spanish activities for aides and teachers

Aide Workshop - demonstrated methods for bilingual instruction

Visitation of Title VII Program in Edgewood, San Antonio- conferred with curriculum writer

Black History Week - arranged speakers, displays, programs
Idea Swap Workshop - collected and demonstrated games and activities for 4th and 5th grade teachers to make

Development of Units in both Spanish and English - each unit will be 20 - 30 minutes per day for one to three weeks
- La Familia
- El Concepto de Sí Mismo
- El Barrio
- La Escuela
- La Región
- El País
- El Continente
- El Mundo
- El Sistema Solar
- El Universo

At this time, the writers are developing instructional units for the 1974-75 priject and providing teachers a personal contact with the project staff.

Several conferences with each project elementary principal and the project evaluator have been held concerning the progress of the project in his school. In summarizing the comments made by principals concerning the writers, the following comments and recommendations have been most frequently encountered.

1. In Allison Elementary School, the role of the writer has been defined differently by the writer, the project staff, and the principal. Consequently, the principal has expressed concern several times about whether or not the writer's actual activities correspond to the duties as proposed.

   In Allison Elementary School there is a need for project staff, writer, and principal to meet and clearly define in writing the objectives and duties of the writer.

2. Associated with several inservice workshops, information concerning times, dates, and teachers to participate has been interpreted differently by the writers, the principals, and the project staff. The writers, consequently, were placed in the confusing position of having information which was at times more complete and at other times less complete than the principal's and the teachers'.

   There is general need for increased communication with the writers on the part of project staff and principals. Writers should be informed in writing of all project activities and update on all changes made. The writers should not, however, have the responsibility for communications between the project administration and the principals or teachers.

3. The time the writers spend in the project schools, especially in the classrooms, has a beneficial effect upon their awareness and understanding of instructional needs and upon teacher attitudes toward the project. On the other hand, working together developing instructional units away from the interruptions encountered in the schools is very efficient.

   A more flexible in-school/in-office schedule might be more facillitating in maximizing both benefits.

4. The writers are in a uniquely advantageous position for helping teachers emphasize the background and culture of project students. Much more direct and immediate aide to teachers in this area is needed.

   Writers should make every effort to develop and/or secure culturally related materials and activities with which teachers can be provided.

5. The project evaluator and the writers have met and discussed various aspects of their activities. During these discussions, the need for an overall guide to follow and/or a person to direct them has been frequently mentioned. The help they have been receiving from Ms. Gloria Gamez has been greatly appreciated.

   The writers need to specify their goals and objectives for the remaining portion of the 1973-74 year as a group and individually. Some form of time line describing activities and comletion dates would be helpful in assessing their progress and accomplishments.

   The writers need to be consulted soon for delineating objectives and defining roles for curriculum development in the 1974-75 project.